DRAFT NOTES:
Water Management Coordinating Team Meeting – 10/21/99
9:30-1:00

AGENDA:

- **Asset Lists**
- **DWRSIM Runs**
- **Demands**
- **Game Summary**
- **End of Stage 1 Scenario**
- **DT Meeting**

I. Introductions - BJ Miller

Reiterate Our Charge:

- Develop and analyze Early and Late Stage 1 with DOI b(2) baseline.

II. Asset List - Steve Hirsh

- November 2 deadline for presentation
- Oct 28 internal deadline
- Some assignments not made
- Follow example format from In-Delta Storage provided by Dave Forkel
- Provide to Steve Hirsh: shirsh@mp.usbr.gov; 916-978-5010 (5005 fax)

C: 8500 cfs expanded Banks has no water supply benefit.
S: Suggest two late lists: early-late and late-late.
S: Add JPOD, Kern package to early Stage 1 - move 8500 expanded Banks to late Stage 1 and make it year round. Also include source shifting and crop shifting.

Assignments:

- Source shifting - S Hirsh
- Kern Package - Dave Shuster
- Intertie - D Shuster and Jim Snow
- Reservoir Reop - Mark Cowan
- Acquisition of Delta islands - Karl Winkler
- Pumping to storage (part of reservoir reop) - D Shuster
- Access to non-project storage - Dave Fullerton
- Changes to flood control operations - Mike Fris
- Manage WQ of Delta island discharges - K. Sharman
- Control of algae growth in CCF - Curtis Creel

- Use of DCC for WQ - put under regulatory flexibility.
- Blending - consultant Linda Smith.
- Shifting refuge supplies - Joel Miller
- South Delta Program - Stein Buer, Mark Cowan

III. DWRSIM Runs - George Barnes

- Did not meet Vernalis WQ standard
- Used upstream AFRP for upstream b(2)

User Demands for Gaming:

- Committee established has not decided on how to make demands more realistic (lower) in wet years.
- Committee has not developed individual demand patterns for 1981-1995 for gaming.

C: More realistic demand patterns are needed for daily and monthly models used in gaming.
C: This is an issue for the DT not the modellers.
Q: What is more realistic historic or 1995 demand levels? R: Historic is not realistic anymore; but recognize that 1995 demands may be too high for wet years. Can't use historic because there have been too many changes - WQCP, crop changes, etc.
C: Pattern shifts are important even if total demands have not changed.
S: Put demand patterns in daily model and then allow reductions.
S: Hardwire 15 year demands into game.
C: Export strategy is more important than the delivery pattern.
C: Operators make decisions in real time.
C: Demands change with the weather.
S: We still need a demand pattern for each year.
C: Our EWA actions will affect the demand patterns.
Q: Can we adjust demands during the game? R: Yes.
S: We should pregame patterns, then adjust.

V. Gaming Process - Mike Fris

- 1981-1995 list of issues and concerns, status, and priority table
- tentative prioritization by what would go first - priority may change with specific circumstances - may adjust during game
- List provides a means of scoring - (e.g., what % of A's met)
- Various options/means for addressing issues depending on assets available
- Taking actions/steps changes how you would address issues.
- Real-life we don't have the luxury of this list - nor should we let it control gaming.

- Next step decide what A and B priorities consist of. How much and how long?

S: suggest develop a biological problems list.
Q: Did you use historic or modeled density for salvage? R: Historic..
Q: April 81 - With an Accord Base how did you take into account Accord changes from d 1485 base? R: salvage used to assess fish presence under various hydrologies. Its an issue in the game when we develop new hydrology.
Q: How does Accord account for changes? R: Take was high but we had a high smelt index (FMWT). The pattern of take shifted.
C: Concerned that the model does not predict changes in hydrology on fish distribution.
R: We did take changes into account when making decisions - for example in July of 1981 we took no actions despite historically high salvage because our earlier actions would likely have reduced chances of a July event. We don't know how fish will respond to these changes. Without other data we will have to continue using historical densities. This will be clearer in games 3 and 4. We identified D1485 impacts for 1981 - Accord, EWA, and b(2) will all reduce the impacts.
Q: What about population effects. R: not assessed.
Q: Would Accord have solved 81 salvage problem? R: would have helped.
C: Concerned about the use of so much foresight. R: On the budget approach of scenarios 1 and 2 we have to be conservative and hedge.
Q: Comparisons among scenarios: with historical data as the biological base - what is the effect of changing the base and what affect do gaming actions have? Improvements in the base or game. R: We keep track of both in gaming.
C: Concerned about the biological effects of changing the baseline. Models don't replicate historical conditions.

Gaming Discussion:
Q: How are assets to be shared?
Q: What about the availability of b(2) water for gaming? R: b(2) accounting is still being worked out.
C: b(2) may be easy in some hydrologies.
C: Scenarios 3 and 4 do not require us to account for b(2) during gaming - accounting can occur later.
C: Simulating b(2) as you have is probably within one order of magnitude. Ok to use some basic b(2) assumptions and move forward - but be clear on assumptions.

Q: What next? Our objectives? R: learn something about EWA, b(2), and water costs.
C: Need pressure on DOI to tell us how to operate b(2).
S: Go ahead with our assumptions and later adjust when we get a better definition.
C: Use DOI assumptions and move forward.

C: We need more details in the 15 year list.
C: Need to know what State will do about b(2)

Water Quality:

- Fall flows and February organic
- tradeoffs between water and money

Monday Gaming:

- Provide b(2) assumptions for input into daily model.

Other Subjects:

- Evaluation criteria
- Population effects
- Water Quality/Supply issues
- Non-biological benefits
- Object of scenario evaluations
- ESA assurances and confidence